

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
	)	
Digital Output Protection Technologies	)	MB Docket No. 04-55, 04-56,
and Recording Methods Certifications	)	04-57, 04-58, 04-59, 04-60,
	)	04-61, 04-62, 04-63, 04-64,
All Technologies and Recording Methods	)	04-65, 04-66, 04-68
	)	

**OPPOSITION OF THE CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY & TECHNOLOGY TO  
THE PETITION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION  
BY THE MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., ET AL.**

The Center for Democracy & Technology hereby submits this Opposition to the Petition for Partial Reconsideration and Clarification (“Petition”) filed by the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. (“MPAA”), Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc., Paramount Pictures Corporation, Sony Pictures Entertainment Inc., Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, Universal City Studios LLP, The Walt Disney Company, and Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. (collectively, “the MPAA Petitioners”) in response to the Federal Communications Commission’s August 12, 2004, approval of the TiVoGuard, SmartRight, and other digital output protection technology for use in covered demodulator products.<sup>1</sup>

As an Internet civil liberties organization, CDT’s specific concern and interest in the broadcast flag approach stems from the potential impact of flag regulations on expression and communication online. As we have outlined in previous filings, we believe

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Matter of Digital Output Protection Technology and Recording Method Certifications, Order, MB Docket Nos. 04-55, et al., FCC 04-193 (rel. Aug. 12, 2004) (“Certification Order”).

the FCC appropriately struck a careful balance in the standard set forth in its flag ruling, focusing on the narrow goal of frustrating “indiscriminate redistribution” of content in order to provide a measure of protection for content owners while promoting innovative uses of content, including online, and encouraging the DTV transition.

CDT has followed the approval process for the TiVoGuard and SmartRight technologies closely because they represent an important proving ground for this standard and for the Commission’s stated intent not to “foreclose use of the Internet to send digital broadcast content where robust security can adequately protect the content and the redistribution is tailored in nature.”<sup>2</sup> In the lead-up to the Commission’s decision, we wrote the attached report—“All Eyes on TiVo: The Broadcast Flag and the Internet”—explaining why the approval of TiVo was crucial to preserving the narrow, intended focus of the flag and protecting the Commission’s commitment not to leave out the Internet. We submit the report to the official record now to reiterate these points in light of the MPAA et al.’s Petition for Reconsideration.

The FCC decided correctly on TiVo and SmartRight. These technologies meet the Commission’s stated goal in the flag approach, to create a “speed bump”<sup>3</sup> against the “indiscriminate redistribution of [flagged] content over the Internet or through similar means.”<sup>4</sup> For the Commission to reverse its decision would represent a significant expansion of this scope.

---

<sup>2</sup> FCC Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MB Docket No. 02-230, In the Matter of Digital Broadcast Content Protection (released November 4, 2003 (“Order/FNPRM”) at ¶ 63.

<sup>3</sup> Order/FNPRM at ¶ 19.

<sup>4</sup> Order/FNPRM at ¶ 10.

In their Petition, as in earlier filings, the MPAA et al. argue that the Commission should adopt a localization standard for approval of technologies, in part because some portions of broadcasters' or sports teams' current business models rest on restricting viewing of broadcasts to a specific area.<sup>5</sup> We address this argument at length in the attached paper. While we understand the desire of the MPAA and others to preserve current geographical divisions in markets or prevent out-of-home viewing that they do not authorize, these goals are clearly outside the scope of the flag ruling as explicitly stated by the FCC, and endorsed in earlier statements by the MPAA. The flag rules are simply not designed to stop all "unauthorized" redistributions outside of the home.

The MPAA et al. also argue that the TiVoGuard and SmartRight technologies will allow owners of covered demodulators to register "total strangers" as part of their TiVo "Secure Viewing Group" or SmartRight "Personal Private Network," and that this amounts to indiscriminate redistribution.<sup>6</sup> However, the same argument could be made about several of the proximity-based technologies endorsed by the MPAA, which will allow users to share content with "total strangers" in the same apartment building or college dormitory complex. While such limited redistribution to a small number of people might pose real concerns for content owners, it does not represent the "indiscriminate redistribution" which is the clear focus of the flag rule.

The MPAA et al. additionally raise several scenarios suggesting ways in which, with sufficient effort, users could partially circumvent some of the specific limitations

---

<sup>5</sup> MPAA Petition at 2, 11.

<sup>6</sup> MPAA Petition at 5, 8, 9.

incorporated in the TiVoGuard system.<sup>7</sup> We understand these to be arguments regarding the particular implementation of TiVo, rather than the necessity of proximity limitations *per se*. As such, we leave specific answers to TiVo. However, given the apparent difficulty of switching Secure Viewing Groups (SVGs), the granularity of control that TiVo maintains over group registrations, and the difficulty of locating desired content in any systematic way outside of one's own SVG, these scenarios appear to us examples of how especially enterprising individual owners could slightly expand the narrow restrictions imposed by the TiVoGuard technology, rather than scenarios likely to result in broad "indiscriminate redistribution."<sup>8</sup>

Finally, the MPAA et al. have asked that the Commission allow for private negotiation of changes in content protection technologies as an alternate, expedited track for approval of such changes.<sup>9</sup> As CDT argued in our earlier filings in the broadcast flag proceeding,<sup>10</sup> employing such an approach would undermine the Commission's intent that no "one industry segment exercis[e] a significant degree of control over the decisions regarding the approval and use of content protection and recording technologies in DTV-related equipment."<sup>11</sup> This concern applies no less with respect to significant changes in already approved technologies than for initial approval decisions. The Commission's first round of approval decisions demonstrated admirable transparency. The Commission must

---

<sup>7</sup> MPAA Petition at 4, 12.

<sup>8</sup> We note that, in the event a general exploit *was* discovered based on one of the MPAA's hypothetical scenarios, or some other method, to facilitate indiscriminate redistribution using TiVo devices, both TiVo and the Commission would have several avenues for recourse. This is true for TiVo just as for the other twelve authorized technologies.

<sup>9</sup> MPAA Petition at 13-15.

<sup>10</sup> Reply Comments of Center for Democracy and Technology, MB Docket 02-230 (filed March 15, 2004) ("CDT Comments") at 9.

<sup>11</sup> Order/FNPRM at ¶ 52.

not allow a public, open process for the approval of technologies to be supplanted by opaque, private negotiations.

In summary, the Commission correctly decided each of the issues raised by the MPAA, et al. in its initial consideration of these questions. For the Commission to reverse its position would entail a dramatic expansion of the flag rules, and would compromise the public policy goals set forth by the Commission in this process. While CDT appreciates the concerns of the MPAA and others about unauthorized distribution of their valuable content, the level of control now requested by these companies is significantly beyond that provided for in the flag rule.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Davidson, Associate Director  
Michael Steffen, Policy Analyst

Center for Democracy and Technology  
1634 I St., NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-637-9800  
<http://www.cdt.org>

September 28, 2004

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Alan Davidson, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the Opposition of the Center for Democracy and Technology was served electronically on the following parties on September 28, 2004:

Jonathan L. Rubin, P.A.  
1717 K Street NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
*Counsel for American Antitrust Institute*  
*trubin@microsoft.com*

Christopher Murray  
Consumers Union  
1666 Connecticut Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20009  
*Counsel for Consumers Union*  
*murrch@consumer.org*

Seth D. Greenstein  
McDermott, Will & Emery  
600 Thirteenth St. NW  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
*Counsel for Digital Transmission  
Licensing Administrator LLC*  
*sgreenstein@mwe.com*

Bruce H. Turnbull  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
1501 K Street NW, Suite 100  
Washington, DC 20005  
*Counsel for 4C Entity LLC, Digital  
Content Protection LLC, and Victor  
Co. of Japan Ltd.*  
*bruce.turnbull@weil.com*

Henry Goldberg  
Goldberg, Godles, Wiener & Wright  
1229 Nineteenth St. NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
*Counsel for Hewlett-Packard Company*  
*HGoldberg@G2W2.com*

Gerard J. Waldron  
Mary Newcomer Williams  
Covington & Burling  
1201 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2401  
*Counsel for Microsoft Corp.*  
*gwaldron@cov.com*  
*mwilliams@cov.com*

Kurt A. Wimmer  
Covington & Burling  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2401  
*Counsel for National Football League*  
*kwimmer@cov.com*

Lawrence R. Sidman  
Sara W. Morris  
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP  
1299 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, 10th Fl.  
Washington, DC 20004  
*Counsel for Philips Electronics North  
America Corp. and Thomson*  
*lawrencesidman@paulhastings.com*  
*saramorris@paulhastings.com*

Nathan Mitchler  
Mike Godwin  
Public Knowledge  
1875 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 650  
Washington, DC 20009  
*Counsel for Public Knowledge*  
*nmitchler@publicknowledge.org*  
*mnemonic@well.com*

Laura H. Phillips  
Drinker, Biddle & Reath LLP  
1500 K Street NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005-1209  
*Counsel for RealNetworks, Inc*  
*lphillips@dbi.com.*

Jennifer Coplan  
Debevoise & Plimpton  
919 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
*Counsel for Sony Corp*  
*Jennifer.Coplan@debevoise.com.*

Jon A. Baumgarten  
Bruce E. Boyden  
Proskauer Rose LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
*Counsel for MPAA Parties*  
*jabaumgarten@proskauer.com*  
*bboyden@proskauer.com*

James M. Burger  
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson PLLC  
1200 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Suite  
800  
Washington, DC 20036-6802  
*jburger@dowlohnnes.com*



## **All Eyes on TiVo: The Broadcast Flag and the Internet**

July 26, 2004

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) stands at a crossroads in its ongoing broadcast flag proceeding, with broad implications for the future of the Internet and digital television. Within the next few weeks, the FCC is expected to rule on thirteen content protection technologies submitted under the Commission's interim process for certifying compliance with the flag rules. TiVo, one of the technologies under review, is being opposed by some content owners because it would allow customers to access TV shows they have recorded from a small number of other TiVo devices they register, over the Internet. Resting on the Commission's decision is more than just the viability of TiVo's networking technology—it is whether the broadcast flag can be used to ban even secure and limited transmissions of digital television over the Internet.

CDT has followed the broadcast flag proceeding closely since it began. There is a great public interest in protecting the creators of content so they will feel comfortable releasing their works in new digital forms that include the Internet. At the same time, those protections must balance public interests in access to content—including access online. The standard set forth by the FCC for access to DTV programs attempted to strike that critical balance: by the FCC's own account, it was intended to protect digital television broadcasts but still allow access to programs over the Internet, so long as that access did not lead to mass indiscriminate redistribution of programs to the public.

TiVo's technology should clearly be authorized under the standard put forward by the FCC, yet it is being opposed. As such, TiVo is an important first test case for whether the FCC will improperly expand the flag rules to prohibit even highly secure ways of viewing programs that use the Internet.

### **1. Background**

The "broadcast flag," was proposed to the FCC, and approved in November of 2003, as a way to protect DTV broadcast from massive redistribution over the Internet. DTV is set to replace the analog broadcasts received by almost all existing televisions in the U.S. by 2006. The FCC adopted the flag regulations despite great controversy. They were



approved with an explicit and narrow goal: “to prevent the indiscriminate redistribution of [flagged] content over the Internet or through similar means.”

Under the regulations, all new digital televisions and other devices that receive DTV content will be required to include approved digital rights management (DRM) that will help shield protected programs from massive redistribution. These rules will affect TV sets, computers, DVD recorders, and TiVo-like digital video recorders, which will all have to include government-approved technologies to handle marked DTV programs. CDT’s report, “Implications of the Broadcast Flag: A Public Interest Primer” provides a summary and an in-depth analysis of the flag rules.

When the Commission released the flag rules, it began a public process for approving protection technologies. TiVo and nine other companies initially submitted proposals. Decisions on the proposals are expected within two weeks. Whereas the approval process was initially to focus on whether proposed technologies succeeded at the narrow aim promoted by the studios and agreed to by the FCC—frustrating indiscriminate redistribution online—there is a risk that the process is now being used to more expansively control how, when, and where people watch TV.

## **2. The Broadcast Flag and the Internet**

In its broadcast flag ruling, the FCC sought to address concerns that mandated content protection would harm consumers and new technologies. It explicitly said that it intended to “facilitate innovative consumer uses and practices, including use of the Internet as a secure means of transmission,”<sup>1</sup> and that, “We do not wish to foreclose use of the Internet to send digital broadcast content where robust security can adequately protect the content and the redistribution is tailored in nature.”<sup>2</sup> The broadcast flag was not designed to prevent, for example, a parent from securely emailing a local high school sports broadcast to a child at college, or from transmitting a recorded broadcast to a vacation home for later viewing. It was designed to inhibit releasing a recorded show for anyone on the Internet to download.

The focus on massive redistribution enshrined in the Commission’s order was designed to make sure this balance was struck. Emphasizing this narrow goal, the Commission repeated the phrase “indiscriminate redistribution” *no fewer than thirteen times* in the flag order. CDT’s report on the flag scheme underscored the importance of this standard.

Flag proponents appeared to agree with this limited scope for the flag rules. For example, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) General Counsel, Fritz Attaway testified to this effect before Congress in Spring 2003:

---

<sup>1</sup> FCC Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MB Docket No. 02-230, In the Matter of Digital Broadcast Content Protection (released Nov. 4, 2003) (“Order/FNPRM”) at ¶ 10.

<sup>2</sup> Order/FNPRM at ¶ 63.

Rep. BOUCHER: So would you agree, then, that as the broadcast flag proposal goes forward, if it does go forward, that legitimate fair use applications, including those that involve use of the Internet, should be permitted?

Mr. ATTAWAY: The broadcast flag is intended to prevent the widespread redistribution of content. If technology exists to permit secure delivery of that content to your summer home or to your office, that is not something that the broadcast flag is intended to prevent, and presumably, it will not.<sup>3</sup>

The current opposition to TiVo, however, risks undoing this crucial understanding about the proper and intended scope of the flag.

### **3. TiVoGuard Secure Viewing Groups**

TiVo's proposed TiVoGuard technology would allow the owners of popular TiVo digital video recorders to play back recorded content on other networked devices within a Secure Viewing Group. Authorized devices could be a TiVo in the office or one in a relative's home, for example. Computers with an attached "dongle"—a small piece of hardware that contains protected cryptographic information—could also be authorized for playback. TiVo subscribers would be allowed to authorize up to ten devices of their choosing as part of the same Secure Viewing Group.<sup>4</sup> In order to prevent subscribers from "daisy-chaining" devices to link groups and create large sharing networks, each device would only be allowed to be part of a single group.<sup>5</sup> Playback on computers would only be possible when the authorized dongle was attached. Encryption would be used to protect content from being captured during transmission between authorized devices or being read from the hard disk of an authorized PC or DVR.<sup>6</sup>

This system would allow important personal uses of recorded television shows while making widespread redistribution exceptionally difficult. For example, with the TiVo system it would be possible to transmit recorded shows to an office over the Internet. It would likewise be possible to transfer recorded shows onto a laptop to watch on an

---

<sup>3</sup> House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property Oversight Hearing on "Copyright Piracy Prevention and the Broadcast Flag." (Mar. 6, 2003).

<sup>4</sup> See *generally* Broadcast Flag Certification of TiVo Inc., in Docket MB 04-63 (filed Feb. 27, 2004). TiVo has indicated that in exceptional circumstances, authorization for up to twenty devices would be permitted.

<sup>5</sup> Specifically, it can only be part of a single group at a time. In theory, it could be possible to switch a device back and forth between groups, though apparently this can only be done with some difficulty. Based on TiVo's filings, it is clear that if frequent switching of viewing groups ever became a problem, it would be easy to impose limitations on the frequency or amount of switching.


<sup>6</sup> The proposed encryption scheme would be much stronger than that currently used to protect DVDs, for example.

airplane flight. On the other hand, it would be exceptionally difficult—perhaps practically impossible—to directly circumvent the TiVo protections in order to post a recorded program on a peer-to-peer file-sharing network.<sup>7</sup>

#### 4. Objections to TiVoGuard

The MPAA and the NFL have opposed approval of TiVo’s technology “because it does not include any distance-based limitations on transmissions of the content.”<sup>8</sup> The MPAA has lobbied generally for rejection of any technology that does not “constrain unauthorized distribution beyond the...set of compliant, authorized devices within a tightly defined geographic area around [a DTV receiver]. For example...the set of authorized devices within or in the immediate vicinity (e.g., the yard, garage, or driveway) of [a] home.”<sup>9</sup>

This approach would profoundly misinterpret the standard set forth by the Commission. Such an approach would effectively entail a prohibition on use of the Internet by DTV devices, as evident in a slide presented by the MPAA to the FCC in a recent *ex parte* communication:



<sup>7</sup> It might be possible to indirectly circumvent the protections through analog reversion or other means—but these are well-known limitations with the flag scheme generally, not holes in TiVo’s protection technology.

<sup>8</sup> Opposition to the Application of TiVo for Interim Authorization of TiVoGuard by the Motion Picture Association of America, *et al.*, in Docket MB 04-63 (filed Apr. 12, 2004) (“MPAA Opposition”) at 3.

<sup>9</sup> Comments of the Motion Picture Association of America, *et al.*, in MB Docket 02-230 (filed Feb. 13, 2004) at 7-8.

The text accompanying the slide makes clear that transmission over the Internet is ruled out because it allows access by “non-local” devices. The MPAA has suggested a variety of technical measures that would allow home electronics to distinguish local area networks from the Internet.<sup>10</sup> Its filings, however, have opposed any technology that would connect to the public Internet—even for secure retransmissions.

As much as we understand the desire of the MPAA and the NFL to preserve current geographical divisions in markets or prevent out-of-home viewing that they do not authorize, these goals are clearly outside the scope of the flag ruling as explicitly stated by the FCC, and endorsed in earlier statements by the MPAA. The flag rules are simply not designed to stop all “unauthorized” redistributions outside of the home. Such an interpretation of the rule would expand the broadcast flag well beyond its original scope to create a broad regulatory regime for control over personal use of television broadcasts.

## 5. Aborted Proposals

As alluded to above, TiVo is not the only company to propose a system for secure transmission of recorded programs among a small number of devices over the Internet. Of the thirteen proposed technologies, at least four originally included specifications for such a system.<sup>11</sup> Under pressure from content owners, three of those companies agreed to cut innovative Internet features out of their products.<sup>12</sup>

The Commission’s decision on TiVo is thus crucial not only to ensure that consumers are given access to TiVo’s innovative system, but to make clear to other developers that secure Internet technologies are permitted. If the Commission does not approve TiVo and clearly reaffirm the narrow scope of the flag, it will be confirming the warnings of the flag’s opponents who predicted the regulation would become a way to strangle innovation in DTV products—especially in computers and online.

## 5. Conclusion

In its initial flag ruling, the FCC put forward a clear standard—technologies would be approved if they provided reasonable protections<sup>13</sup> against indiscriminate redistribution

---

<sup>10</sup> These include limitations on “time to live” (TTL) for data packets, periodic tests of roundtrip time for transmissions to approved devices, and limitation of transmissions to a single “subnet.” See, e.g. Legal and Policy Issues Raised by TiVoGuard, by Motion Picture Association of America, *et al.*, in Docket MB 04-63 (filed July 16, 2004) at 9-10.

<sup>11</sup> These were Thomson, *et al.*’s SmartRight technology, Real’s Helix DRM System, Microsoft’s Windows DRM System, and TiVo’s proposal.

<sup>12</sup> All three agreed to limit TCP/IP transmissions by limiting maximum round-trip-time (RTT) and setting time-to-live (TTL) on all packets to 3. The MPAA filed formal oppositions to each of these systems before the modifications were made and then, in each case, withdrew its opposition following the concessions.

<sup>13</sup> In the Commission’s words, “a speed bump.” Order/FNPRM at ¶ 19.

online. Several companies, including TiVo, put forward proposals that clearly met this standard. In response, those opposing the technologies have proposed a new standard for approval that would profoundly alter the meaning of the flag ruling.

The FCC has the opportunity to affirm the balance it tried to strike in the initial flag rule. CDT hopes it will make clear that secure Internet technologies are permitted, and that the Internet will not be locked out of the digital television transition.

**For more information, please contact:**

Alan Davidson, Associate Director  
Jerry Berman, President  
Michael Steffen, Policy Analyst  
Center for Democracy and Technology  
<http://www.cdt.org/>